

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 17 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11-14, 16 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,047, and Savitzky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083. (Final Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to more specifically clarify that the original receipt is specific to the document.

Bauer discloses a quota system for tracking and limiting the resources available to a user. The quota system tracks and limits the amount of usage and is therefore not specific to a document.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as amended, include wording that an original receipt specific to a document is created on a server. The original document specific receipt is updated to indicate at least one page of the document was provided to a print job agent. The original document specific receipt is copied to the print job agent. Neither Savitsky nor Bauer disclose a performing these steps on an original receipt specific to a document.

In addition, Applicants maintain their previous arguments related to the failure of Bauer and Savitsky to even disclose an original receipt.

In view of Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 9, and 17 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson and
James E. Clough

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 12/14/2004
(719) 260-7900